

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application in view of the amendments, herein, and the following remarks:

The following claims are *pending*: 13, 15-22 and 24-38.

The following claims are *independent*: 13, 22, 31 and 38.

The following claims have previously been *cancelled* without prejudice or disclaimer: 1-12, 14 and 23.

Please *amend* claims 13, 22, 31 and 38; although these claims have been amended herein to provide clarification, correct typographical inaccuracies and/or informalities, and/or to better track practical/commercial implementations/practices (hereinafter “amendment,” “amendments,” and/or “amended”), Applicant submits that the originally filed claims are patentable and reserves the right to pursue the originally filed claims (as well as any claims dependent therefrom) at a later time and/or in one or more continuation/divisional application(s). Applicant submits that these new claims and/or claim amendments are supported throughout the originally filed specification and that no new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Office Action rejected claim(s) 13, 15-22 and 24-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rivette, US Patent No. 6,499,026 (hereinafter “Rivette”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and submits that a showing of anticipation has not been

made and that Rivette does not discuss every element of the noted claim(s).

### Requirements to Establish Anticipation

The MPEP prescribes that, “when evaluating the scope of a claim, *every limitation in the claim must be considered*,” (§ 2106 II(C), emphasis added) and, “*All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.*” (§ 2143.03, emphasis added). Applicant submits that the pending rejection has failed to consider “every limitation in the claim” and “[a]ll words in [the] claim” in judging the patentability of the claim against the prior art by mischaracterizing claim elements and/or over-generalizing the applied reference(s). As a consequence, has failed to establish a case of anticipation. 35 U.S.C. § 102.

### Missing Claim Element(s)

Applicant submits Rivette does not discuss, and is in fact missing at least the following element(s) as recited, *inter alia*, in amended independent claim 1:

A processor-implemented method comprising:

...  
presenting a tiered selectable corporate ownership structure including the determined plurality of corporate entities showing ownership relationships and the user selectable corporate information category tab based on the retrieved corporate information,

wherein a first one of the plurality of corporate entities is at least a partial owner of a second one of the plurality of corporate entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream from the second one of the plurality of corporate entities,

wherein a third one of the plurality of corporate entities is at least partial owned by a fourth one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the fourth one of the plurality of entities ...

...

1  
2 The Office Action asserts the above claimed elements are shown in Rivette (col. 27,  
3 line(s) 53-65, col. 34, lines 56-67, col. 35, lines 49-51, col. 39, lines 35-54, col. 72, lines 20-67,  
4 col. 79, lines 9-40, col. 80, lines 44-67, col. 81, lines 1-2, 23-26, 44-67 and col. 82, lines 1-8).  
5 Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

6 Contrary to the Office Action's assertions, Applicant submits that Rivette discusses  
7 maintaining a patent portfolio by grouping patents based patent claim coverage. For  
8 example, Applicant notes that Rivette's "system ... maintains one or more [patent] groups,"  
9 wherein "[e]ach of the groups comprises any number of the patents" of a corporate patent  
10 portfolio (Rivette, Abstract; emphasis added), and Rivette's Figure 1 shows a patent claim tree  
11 based on patent claims (Rivette, Figure 1). Applicant further notes Rivette's Figure 18  
12 illustrates a "hierarchical organization" of patent "groups" defined by "user defined ... patent  
13 attributes," including a "root [patent] group" which further comprises "child [patent] groups"  
14 such as company patent portfolios "to acquire, patents about bikes, and litigation ..." (Rivette,  
15 Figure 18, col. 72, line(s) 34 - 50). Applicant submits Rivette's patent group structure based  
16 on patent attributes, is fundamentally different from the claimed "tiered selectable corporate  
17 ownership structure including the determined plurality of corporate entities showing  
18 ownership relationships" (emphasis added), much less the claimed:

19 presenting a tiered selectable corporate ownership structure including  
20 the determined plurality of corporate entities showing ownership  
21 relationships and the user selectable corporate information category tab  
22 based on the retrieved corporate information,  
23 wherein a first one of the plurality of corporate entities is at least a  
24 partial owner of a second one of the plurality of corporate entities and is  
25 graphically presented as being organizationally upstream from the  
26 second one of the plurality of corporate entities,

1                   wherein a third one of the plurality of corporate entities is at  
2                   least partial owned by a fourth one of the plurality of entities and is  
3                   graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from  
4                   the fourth one of the plurality of entities ...

5  
6                   as recited in amended independent claim 1.

7                   Accordingly, Applicant submits that Rivette's patent database management system is  
8                   different from at least the cited claim elements as recited in independent claim 1. For at least  
9                   the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that the pending rejection has  
10                  mischaracterized the language of the claim element(s) and/or the applied reference and, thus,  
11                  has not established a case of anticipation. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests  
12                  reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection(s) and allowance of claim(s).

13                  Should the Examiner maintain the rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the  
14                  Examiner provide specific citations and explanations describing how each and every element  
15                  of the pending claims are allegedly anticipated by the cited reference, providing indications of  
16                  specific, alleged correspondences between claim elements and cited portions of the applied  
17                  reference; more specifically, Applicant respectfully requests additional clarification as to how  
18                  and specifically why the Examiner believes Rivette's "system" that "maintains one or more  
19                  groups" of patents, is allegedly analogous to and/or anticipates the cited claim elements as  
20                  recited in independent claim 1.

21                  Although of different scope than independent claim 1, Applicant submits claims 13, 15-  
22                  22 and 24-38 (and as a consequence any claims depending therefrom) are all patentable over  
23                  Rivette for at least similar reasons as discussed above when identifying deficiencies in the  
24                  Office Action's application of Rivette with regard to independent claim 1. Accordingly,

1 Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection(s) and  
2 allowance of claim(s).

### 3 CONCLUSION

4 Applicant asserts that the above remarks, which distinguish the claims over the cited  
5 reference(s), pertained only to noted claim element portions. These remarks are believed to  
6 be sufficient to overcome the prior art to this Office Action (and/or any previous office  
7 action(s)) (hereinafter "Office Action(s)"). While many other claim elements and/or bases  
8 for rejection were not discussed, as they have been rendered moot based on the above  
9 amendments and/or remarks, Applicant asserts that all such remaining and not discussed  
10 claim elements and/or bases for rejection, all, also are distinguished over the prior art, and  
11 Applicant reserves the opportunity to more particularly traverse, remark and/or distinguish  
12 over any such remaining claim elements and/or bases for rejection at a later time, should it  
13 become necessary. Further, any remarks that were made in response to the Office Action(s)'  
14 objection and/or rejection as to any one claim element, and which may have been re-asserted  
15 as applying to other Office Action(s) objection(s) and/or rejection(s) as to any other claim  
16 element(s), any such re-assertion(s) of remarks are not meant to imply that there is  
17 commonality about the structure, functionality, means, operation, and/or scope of any of the  
18 claim element(s), and no such commonality is admitted as a consequence of any such re-  
19 assertion(s) of remarks. Consequently, the reference(s) cited the Office Action(s) do not result  
20 in the claimed invention(s), there was/is no motivation, basis and/or rationale for such a  
21 combination of references (i.e., cited references do not teach, read on, suggest, or result in the

1 claimed invention(s)), and the claimed invention(s) are not admitted to be prior art. Also,  
2 Applicant does not accept, admit, and/or concede to any assertions, (mis)characterizations  
3 (e.g., of claims, references, and/or otherwise), and/or Official Notice(s) in the Office  
4 Action(s). As such, Applicant does not concede that any claim element(s) have been  
5 anticipated and/or rendered obvious by any of the cited reference(s) and/or any Official  
6 Notice in the Office Action(s). Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the supporting  
7 remarks and claimed inventions, claims 13, 15-22 and 24-38, all: overcome all rejections  
8 and/or objections as noted in the Office Action(s), are patentable over and discriminated  
9 from the cited reference(s), and are in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant  
10 respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection(s) and/or objection(s),  
11 and allowance of all claims.

**Authorization**

Applicant hereby authorizes and requests that the Commissioner charge any additional fees that may be required for consideration of this and/or any accompanying and/or necessary papers to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17209-324. In the event that an extension of time is required (or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time), Applicant requests that the Commissioner grant a petition for an extension of time required to make this response timely, and, Applicant hereby authorizes and requests that the Commissioner charge any fee or credit any overpayment for such an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 17209-324.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate examination of the application in any way, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,  
*Attorney(s) for Applicant,*  
CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP

Dated: April 7, 2011

By: Daniel C. Sheridan/  
Daniel C. Sheridan  
Registration No.: 53,585

**Correspondence Address:**

CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, NY 10112

212-408-5100 (Telephone)  
212-541-5369 (Facsimile)  
patents@chadbourne.com (E-mail)